Consuming the Consumer-Generated Ad

Abstract

This multi-method inquiry probes the experience and effectiveness of consumer-generated advertising (CGA). A one factor (Source Condition: consumer-generated versus no source identified) between subjects experiment demonstrates response advantages for CGAs in terms of personal relevance, perceptions of executional quality, attitude toward the ad (Aad), brand interest and purchase intent. A follow-on content analysis of viewer responses to organically-created and contest-inspired CGAs posted on youtube.com provides deeper insight into viewers’ involvement with and processing of CGAs within a natural viewing environment. We induct a multi-dimensional engagement construct to capture CGA processing advantages on four different levels: engagement with the ad and the ad creation process, engagement with the brand, engagement with the brand community, and engagement with the community-at-large. CGAs do not however present consistent advantages across categories and settings, suggesting a contingency-based understanding of CGA effects.
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“Agencies Beware. [Consumer-generated advertising is] a great reinvention. These are the folks we want to tap into and they are now speaking to each other. Let’s put them to work on their terms, not ours.”

Mike Fasulo
Chief Marketing Office Sony
(Klaassen, 2006)

“Actively pursuing CGA as a marketing strategy is a lazy and irresponsible approach to branding. Furthermore, it is doomed.”

Denise Lee Yohn
BrandChannel.com Columnist
(Yohn, 2006)

Frito-Lay is returning for a third time to consumer-generated advertising (CGA) in the 2010 SuperBowl XLIV, and will allocate five million dollars to media placement if all three of its Doritos CGAs register positively on USA Today’s Super Bowl Ad Meter. Frito-Lay has been a lead user in the leverage of consumer-generated content. In 2008, the company was among the first to place a CGA in the mass media, selecting not only a primetime slot, but the most expensive and far-reaching medium that advertising has to offer: the Super Bowl. Frito Lay’s CGA, “Free Doritos,” beat out professional agencies for the top-rated Super Bowl ad of 2009. In returning to their strategy, managers were “hoping once again to invoke authenticity and approachability” so as to “engage consumers with the brand” (Wong, 2009).

“[The consumer-generated ad we ran on the SuperBowl] exceeded all of our expectations. It was No. 1 on Twitter and on YouTube. You look at any kind of social media outlet out there, and we were at the top. But it wasn’t just about being No. 1. It was about those two guys [the creators]. They were the heroes of our story, and that’s what people were ecstatic about. That kind of social buzz only happens because people want to talk about it, not because a brand pushes its message out there [in the hopes that] people react to it...Whether it’s running a contest for the first consumer-generated Xbox game or giving them a never-been-done-before gaming experience…[CGAs result in our consumers] being engaged.” (Group VP Marketing, Ann Mukherjee)

Consumer co-creation, enabled by technological innovation and social networking infrastructure, has transformed the practice of marketing (Sawhney, Verona, & Prandelli, 2005). Where there once existed a one-way communication flow from media source to consumer, the everyday person is now the
Taking cues from user-generated forums the likes of YouTube, Wikipedia, and Twitter, managers increasingly recognize consumers as self-motivated providers of a rich repository of content capable of strengthening the brand (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2000). Research documents consumers’ abilities to create and disseminate original and sophisticated brand marketing content (Muñiz & Schau, 2007). Firm roles in the marketing process have shifted: managers now decide whether to applaud, repel, or dismiss naturally-created consumer-generated marketing content, or to proactively facilitate consumers’ branded communication ideas (Berthon, Pitt, & Campbell, 2008).

Although CGA started organically in 2004 with George Masters’ creation of “Tiny Machine,” a homegrown folk ad created to celebrate Masters’ “love and appreciation for iPods and Macs” (Ives, 2004), a recent trend involves company-sponsored competitions that actively encourage and enable the creation and dissemination of consumer-generated advertising ideas. In 2004, Converse launched its Converse Gallery website to generate short films for its brand with the instruction: “Converse stands for originality, creativity, and self expression, so make a film that does the same.” More than one thousand consumer-generated commercials were submitted to the Converse site (Walker, 2006). Mozilla Firefox in 2006 became a second mover in this space with a contest to “create short films to promote the Firefox 1.5 browser launch” (Walker, 2006). CGAs are now a steady part of the Firefox marketing plan; a recent Firefox contest attracted over 280 ads (Walker, 2006). Notably, most Firefox ads are of broadcast quality, and reflect the grammars and styles of advertising as developed in the professional realm (Bosman, 2006a; Muñiz & Schau, 2007; Walker, 2006). The business press promoted the CGA phenomenon as a solution to pressing marketing problems: CGA’s inspired grassroots marketing that cut through the clutter with resonant messaging at lower costs (Creamer, 2007; Mills, 2006).

On the heels of industry optimism, Chevrolet launched a CGA contest for its Tahoe brand (Bosman, 2006b). While the company tried to carefully control content by providing a click-and-use template of images, background graphics, music, and structured creative ideas, 20% of consumer-created submissions were disparaging of the brand (Sandoval, 2006). The so-called Chevy Tahoe
experiment placed CGA under the microscope. Marketing professionals debated Chevrolet’s wisdom in “leaving itself open to such a disastrous campaign” and “essentially giving consumers the keys to its brand and its cars” (Neisser, 2006). While marketers like Sony were anxious to “put consumers to work on their own terms” (Klaassen, 2006), the risks of losing control in the new paradigm suddenly loomed large.

For many, the promise of deeper engagement on the part of consumers has won out over concerns about the loss of brand control (Story, 2007). In a move that shocked the advertising community, CGAs solicited through company-sponsored competitions for Frito-Lay’s Doritos, Chevrolet’s HHR, and Dove’s Cream Oil were aired in the 2007 Super Bowl and Academy Awards programs: two of the most high profile, costly platforms offered in traditional media. In viewer polls, CGAs for Dove and Doritos claimed viewer favorite titles, beating out the high production value, company-sponsored ads that aired in competitive slots. CGAs had demonstrated their credentials; the tactic had come of age.

Still, the value of CGA as a marketing tactic remains a subject of continued debate (Jaffe, 2005; Klaassen, 2006). Management apprehension centers on reservations regarding claimed CGA effectiveness and an uncertainty of the risk/reward profile of consumer-created ads. Although decades of research have yielded significant knowledge regarding consumer responses to firm-sponsored advertising (Brown & Stayman, 1992; Vakratsas & Ambler, 1999), virtually nothing is known about consumers’ responses to CGAs. Our multi-method inquiry addresses pending fundamental questions: Do CGAs have advantages over traditional company-sourced ads? What are these advantages, and when and how do they manifest?

What We Know about Consumer-Generated Communications

As a type of consumer-generated content, the differential influence of CGA vis-à-vis company sourced materials may operate in a similar manner to word-of-mouth communications (WOM) (for review of WOM see Schindler & Bickart, 2005). WOM research suggests that interest in particular product
categories can be increased when consumer conversation as opposed to marketer-generated information is provided (Bickart & Schindler, 2001). Bickart and Shindler (2001) suggest that WOM, in the form of discussion boards, is more effective than company-sourced information in engendering interest due to boosts in relevance and credibility. As a personal source of information, WOM reduces uncertainty through information that is thought to be more diagnostic than company communications (Herr, Kardes, & J. Kim, 1991). The enhanced credibility of WOM communications derives from attributions about the source of the message. When content is consumer-generated, the consumer views the source of the message as similar to themselves, thus rendering the communication as more persuasive (Price, Feick, & Higie, 1989). Trustworthiness of the source is a key determinant of persuasiveness (Wilson & Sherrell, 1993) as source motivations and intentions play a vital role in establishing credibility (Eagly, Wood, & Chaiken, 1978). WOM information presented on discussion boards has been shown to engender more trust than information generated by manufacturers (Cheong & Morrison, 2008).

Still, much less is known about CGAs as a particular form of user-generated content. We know why people make CGAs: intrinsic enjoyment, a mission to change perceptions, self promotion, to defend the ego, and to facilitate social goals (Berthon et al., 2008). We know what type of CGAs they are making (i.e., supportive, contrarian, subversive, concordant) (Berthon et al., 2008). We know that people are skillful in CGA production, and make use of the grammars of advertising when crafting organic messages for the brand (Muñiz & Schau, 2007). However, there exists no published empirical research on the relative effectiveness of CGAs specifically or the processes whereby CGAs exert their effects.

Implicit theories regarding CGA processes abound among the managers that embrace CGA in their communications strategies and plans. One common theme is a belief that CGAs somehow involve consumers more deeply than traditional company-sponsored ads. CGA’s ability to deliver enhanced involvement is assumed to result from the added social dimension inherent in consumer-generated content: the community environments into which CGAs are posted, for example, and the active forwarding and sharing of CGAs via youtube.com links, discussion threads, and blogs (Kiley, 2005; Howard, 2006). In addition, CGAs enable the direct and voluntary participation of individuals that love or
hate the brand, thereby adding emotional investment and passion into the advertising experience in ways not possible before (Muñiz & Schau, 2005, 2007; Berthon et al., 2008). CGAs, created by “people like me” rather than vested companies, are also assumed to be more authentic, trustworthy and credible, thereby enhancing the believability and personal relevance of message claims (Moskowitz, 2006).

Practitioners have recently put forth the concept of consumer engagement to help navigate the terrain of co-created advertising (Woodard 2006). Industry professionals describe engagement as a paradigm shift in how they communicate with consumers. Engagement defines a new type of active, participatory communications, the exemplary case being Facebook’s “engagement ads” that prompt users to interact with the brand and the ad material by encouraging comments about the brand and its users, or getting people to add specific event dates to their calendars to ensure future interactions with the brand (Vascellaro, 2008). Joe Plummer, former Chief Research Officer of the Advertising Research Foundation, conceptualizes engagement as including the elements of co-creation, relevance, and resonance that define CGAs at their core:

“Engagement starts from the vantage point of the customer. By starting there and thinking about whether they are engaged, how can we engage them, and how can we help them achieve their desires, goals or needs…you become more relevant. Engagement is about providing messages, services and advertising storytelling in a way that resonates. The chord to engagement is the notion of co-ownership of a brand, where the brand owner is in part the customer. You get there through this act of co-creation. Engagement occurs when brand messages create a richer, personal, and more relevant meaning. Through engagement you achieve both a bonding relationship and differentiation from other brands.” (Kalehoff, 2006)

Recently, the Advertising Research Council, the Association of National Advertisers, and the American Association of Advertising Agencies joined forces to create engagement councils “to provide an industry-leading peer discussion forum for the continuous refinement and application of the engagement construct” (“ARF,” 2009). Still, the nature and process of engagement have yet to be clarified: engagement is at once “the turning on of a prospect to a brand idea enhanced by surrounding context” (Plummer, n.d. p. 10), an attention mechanism (Heath, 2009), a state of involvement (S. Kim, Haley, & Koo, 2009), an antecedent to involvement (Wang, 2006), and a biological response (Marci, 2006). While
practitioners hail engagement as the explanatory construct for the new communications paradigm, the
construct has failed to garner traction within the academic marketing community. Specifically, there exists
no academic research to clarify the concept, and none that investigates whether and how CGAs work to
engage. Research has yet to illuminate whether CGA presents a fundamentally different advertising
paradigm, or persuades in the same ways that fifty years of research on company-sponsored advertising
has exposed.

**Research Goals and Objectives**

This research sheds light on the speculative CGA-engagement connection, and provides
empirical evidence of the relative effectiveness of CGAs. We report on two studies designed to increase
understanding of viewers’ reactions to and processing of CGAs, particularly as this compares to
traditional company-produced ads. A one factor (Source Condition: CGA versus No Identified Source)
between subjects experiment explores response profiles for consumer-generated advertising, while a
content analysis of viewer responses to CGAs posted on youtube.com provides deeper insight into
processing issues within a natural viewing environment. We offer a multi-dimensional engagement
construct to capture CGA processing advantages on four different levels: engagement with the ad and the
ad creation process, engagement with the brand, engagement with the brand community, and
engagement with the community-at-large. CGAs do not present consistent advantages, however,
suggesting a contingency-based understanding of CGA effects.

**Study 1: Experimental Study of CGA Processing and Effects**

Our first study was designed to test practitioners’ assumption that CGAs present communication
advantages over traditional company-sponsored advertising, and to identify processing factors that drive
CGA response. We conducted an experiment to test the working hypotheses that subjects who viewed
consumer-generated advertisements would have more favorable attitudes towards the ad and the brand,
and that CGAs would illicit higher levels of involvement, personal relevance, and intention to consider the
brand.
We chose Toyota Yaris as a relevant, new-to-market brand with significant consumer-generated advertising content appearing both on CurrentTV and YouTube channels. Further, Yaris was launched during the quarter in which we conducted our experiment, and was thus relatively free of bias from entrenched attitudes and experiences that could affect responses to the ads. The brand’s target market of men and women 18-30 also matched the student respondent population that would be the involved in our experiment on CGAs.

Four 30-second Yaris CGAs were selected. Four judges reviewed thirty Yaris CGAs and rated them on executional quality (7-point scales, low to high) and message content (7-point scales, low to high). Variation along these two dimensions known to affect advertising response (Mitchell 1986) yielded suitable stimuli to test our hypotheses. A pretest confirmed that we had selected two ads with high brand message content and two with low content (F4,119 = 20.48, p<.001), and two ads with high perceived executional characteristics and two with low perceptions of the quality of the execution of the ad (F4,119 = 6.70, p<.001).

The experiment involved a one factor (source condition: ad identified as CGA versus no source given) between-subjects design. Subjects were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: they were either told the ad they were about to see was created by a consumer (N=99), or were given no information concerning the source of the ad (N=97). By manipulating the source of company-created executions, this study thus examines consumer-generated ads that follow the trope and persuasive elements of traditional-company produced advertising. These ads are distinguished from company-sourced ads only in that they originate from non-company sources.

After viewing the ad once, 196 undergraduate business students filled out a paper and pencil survey containing diagnostics regarding brand attitudes, behaviors, and cognitions, as well as involvement and response profiles for viewers of the ad (Schlinger, 1979). Table 1 contains operationalizations of our measures of advertising response.
Results

Experimental results confirmed our working hypothesis. There was a significant main effect of ad source on a majority of response measures; CGAs outperformed company-sponsored ads across a range of attitudinal and behavioral dimensions. Specifically, subjects who were told the ad was consumer-generated had higher overall attitudes toward the ad \( (t, 194 = 2.19, p<.05) \) and higher overall perceptions of execuctional quality \( (t, 194 = 2.26, p<.05) \). Behaviors related to the brand, including brand interest \( (t, 194 = 3.46, p<.01) \) and brand purchase intent \( (t, 194 = 2.77, p<.01) \), were also higher in the consumer-generated condition. There was also a significant main effect of source condition on our personal relevance measure \( (t, 194=2.40, p<.05) \), with CGA viewers claiming more personal resonance with the message in the ad. Mediation analysis demonstrates that the effect of CGA on \( A_{ad} \) was fully mediated by these perceptions of relevance. The four step test for mediation (Baron & Kenny, 1986) was performed:

1. the direct effect of ad type (CGA/No Source Provided) on \( A_{ad} \) was established \( \beta(0.16, t(194) = 2.19, p<.05) \)
2. ad type was shown to correlate with the proposed mediator (relevance) \( \beta(0.17, t(194) = 2.40, p<.05) \)
3. the mediator (relevance) was shown to correlate with the outcome variable (\( A_{ad} \)) \( \beta(0.413, t(194) = 6.33, p<.001) \)
4. when both the criterion variable (ad type) and mediator (relevance) were included as predictors the criterion variable (ad type) was no longer significant \( \beta(0.87, t(194) = 1.32, p>.10) \) but the mediator (relevance) remained significant \( \beta(0.40, t(194) = 6.02, p<.001) \) thus demonstrating full mediation. There were no significant differences in terms of ad-based behaviors, including saving the ad link on their computer, watching the ad again, telling someone else about the ad, or forwarding the ad \( (t, 194= 1.48, p>.10) \). Overall, this results pattern confirms practitioners’ assumptions that CGAs are inherently more persuasive, an advantage related at least in part to the enhanced levels of personal relevance that drive the effectiveness of the ads.

Discussion

Our experimental results demonstrate that when ads are identified as consumer-generated, they provide benefit by increasing perceptions of personal relevance of the advertising message, enhancing attitudes toward the ad and encouraging brand-relevant intentions and behaviors. Based on the results
pattern, the persuasive benefits of CGA seem to accrue because of CGAs capacity to increase an ad’s resonance with the viewer, or, put differently, to strengthen the viewer’s engagement of and involvement with the message content in the ad. Upon reflection, engagement with the ad message may present but one piece of the engagement puzzle: ad engagement fails to fully consider the defining elements that characterize the contemporary advertising landscape of which CGAs are part, namely, consumer co-creation and the social dimensions of advertising. The laboratory environment that allowed a clean test of the effects of CGA-identified advertising at once obscured the social dimensions inherent with co-created advertising. We sought a more complete understanding of people’s engagement with CGAs, as precipitated within a natural viewing environment. Our second study addresses the question: Do CGAs facilitate consumer engagement? If so, what is nature of the process whereby people engage with CGAs?

Study 2: Reactions to CGAs within a Natural Viewer Environment

Our second study provides a phenomenological inquiry of viewer responses to CGA within the natural viewing environment of youtube.com. We sourced fourteen consumer-generated ads posted on YouTube.com for in-depth study, and content analyzed the verbatim transcripts contained in viewer posts relating to these ads. Our goals were to: (1) inform a holistic understanding of CGA experiences within a natural viewing environment; (2) go beyond psychological responses to CGAs to consider the sociological context of the experience of CGAs; and (3) offer a deeper probe of the CGA phenomenon by looking at different types of CGAs.

Two types of CGAs were studied. First are contest-generated CGAs created in response to a manufacturer solicitation for branded advertising messages. Per our prior discussion, contest-driven CGAs are notable for their role in driving marketer adoption of the technique. Second are the organically-created CGAs developed naturally at the hands of brand consumers without prompting or intervention from the companies behind these brands. Organic CGAs have been singled out in the marketing literature as sophisticated and powerfully persuasive communication tools for a special class of high involvement brands (Muñiz & Schau, 2007; Berthon et al., 2008). Building from the source credibility literature (Wilson & Sherrell, 1993; Eagly et al., 1978), we postulated that naturally-occurring CGAs might
present communication advantages over solicited CGAs in light of their purity and distance from the possible contamination of corporate sponsorship. Specifically, we considered whether organic CGAs might be judged as more authentic, trusted, and credible than contest-inspired ads.

To provide a broad inquiry of the phenomenon, we selected 14 ads spanning a range of categories (cars, personal care, snack food, video entertainment, computer software, arts, and politics), involvement levels (high versus low), and advertising strategies (informational, humor, consumer values, transformational). Eight high-profile contest-generated CGAs from the 2007 Super Bowl and 2007 Academy Awards were included: two winning advertisements from the “Doritos: Crash the Superbowl” competition (Live the Flavor and Check Out Girl); one winning ad involved with the “Chevy Superbowl College Ad Challenge” for the Chevy HRR brand (Carwash); and five advertisements associated with Dove Cream Oil’s Academy Awards competition including the winning ad (Knowing You’re Beautiful), two finalists (Fly Like a Dove and Live in Color), the most popular ad per youtube.com viewer ratings (Feeling Divine), and the most downloaded ad (Wash Away the Lines). One winning ad for a company sponsored contest for the online marketplace Etsy (Handmade Moments are Everywhere). Five organically-created CGAs were also studied, one from each of the following brands: Firefox, SONY Playstation, SONY Wii, World of Warcraft, and the well-publicized CGA spoofing the “1984” Apple ad in support of Obama 2009. One month of viewer conversations within youtube.com were analyzed for each ad posted, yielding 1,336 unique postings for the 14 ads.

Content analysis of viewer comments was iterative and emergent (Miles & Huberman, 1984). An interpretive group (Thompson et al. 1989) comprising four individuals provided a broadened perspective on the analysis and an ability to cross-check individual coder interpretations. Coding was conducted independently and then discussed among team members; initial codes were refined through group debate. Throughout the process, the literature was accessed to inform evolving interpretations of the data. Coding continued until agreement on interpretations was reached and inducted constructs were fully specified.
Results

Our analysis uncovered qualitative differences in people’s CGA experiences, and supports four different levels or types of engagement, each with a different focal object for the engagement response: (1) engagement with the advertising; (2) engagement with the brand; (3) engagement with the brand community; and (4) engagement with the community-at-large (See Figure 1). While these individual engagement facets are familiar from the published marketing literatures, our analysis refines and dimensionalizes these concepts while also offering an integrative theoretical structure that unites what have been presented as disconnected ideas and frames.

As Figure 1 shows, the facets of our engagement model are arrayed hierarchically, indicating subsequently deeper and more impactful levels of engagement as the focal object transitions from the ad to the community-at-large. Within our conceptualization, engagement with the ad, which practitioners generally consider as the ultimate indicator of engagement, and which we uncovered as a primary effect in our own experimental study, stands as but the first step in a complex engagement process. This broadened perspective takes into consideration the co-creative process wherein consumers interact not only in the role of viewers, but also as active co-generators of brand meaning content and participants in the social relationships that bind people to communities and brands. Our framework shifts the paradigm in which CGAs have been typically considered from a viewer-response model to an active process perspective on the role of advertising in the establishment and negotiation of relationships with brands.
**Type 1: Engagement with the Ad.** Our most basic type of engagement focuses squarely on the ad as focal object and includes three sub-facets of response: actively engaging the ad message through cognitive elaboration of content; engaging with the context of the CGA process; and engagement via the entertainment value of the ad.

*Ad Message Elaboration:* Ad message elaboration includes counter- and support-arguments demonstrating reflection on and extended thought and contemplation of the true message, meaning, or take-away of the ad. The construct is captured in Baker and Lutz’ (1987) advertising-message involvement, which also focuses on cognitive elaboration of ad message.
claims. Ad message elaboration reflects the central route to the processing of advertising content (MacKenzie and Lutz 1989; Petty et al. 1983) and mirrors the type of audience involvement that has been pivotal in the study of advertising (Zaichkowsky 1985). Results from Study 1 also implicate message elaboration as a core process in the development of $A_{ad}$. The following quotes illustrate viewers’ deeper cognitive processing of CGA messages and claims.

This commercial asks ‘If you could change something, what would you change?’… i think you are misinterpreting the intention. The ad ACTUALLY says women DON'T need to constantly think about their ‘flaws’; ‘wash them away.’ This is seen in the end of the commercial when none of the women have red lines on them anymore--and all of them are happy. They know Dove is for REAL women and also realize all women are beautiful!!!…Great message and VERY CLEAR. – Dove

I liked this ad because it didn’t go for the false sincerity and phony, glam-crazed, Hollywood "image of perfection" attitude. Ya know what I mean? The whole "I cried for days when I heard Brittany chopped off her hair, but when I heard five more US Marines were killed in Anbar, Iraq, I went shopping" mind-set. – Dove

Counterarguments wherein viewers refute ad claims and question the message or source were frequently registered in the online posts. Unlike company-generated ads which emanate from an unambiguous source, CGAs stem from a diverse set of unknown authors, thus providing a catalyst for legitimacy debates. For example:

I cannot believe everybody in this video actually knows what's IE (internet Explorer) and what's firefox. It's not totally what my experience tells me. So fake. Don't try this kind of propaganda. --Firefox

Sorry, your video couldn’t convince me. Why couldn’t it convince me? Well I dont like childish games (scratch Wii out), X360 is an option but the PS3 is literally 10 times better, ok 3 times better. – Wii

Elaborations on the CGA Process: Viewer postings support that CGA ad elaboration extends to inference-making not just about ad content, but also about the CGA process itself. The unique characteristics of CGA, when compared to traditional company-created advertising, offer additional avenues for context elaboration including thoughts about the CGA contest, the process of ad creation, and reflections on the ad creator him/herself. CGA process elaboration is demonstrated by the following...
conversations in which individuals question the Doritos CGA contest executions and ponder the process overall.

The FRITOS "contest" was a "scam". It was pre-determined who the winner was. Final 5, all inside the biz people or connected people. CEO, Mullins Ad Agency, Feb 4, 2007 - producer of Checkout Girl, Hollywood, look up her credit online...

What do u mean look up her credit?

Read down the comments on the Doritos' site. The producer is out of Hollywood, last film Pirates of the Carribien, girl actress, LA girl with professional credits, improv etc. ... yea, real amateur project. It was a commercial stunt by the ad people for Doritos. My grammar ...should have said credits.

What a farce! Is this the future of You Tube? I can watch PROFESSIONAL commercials on TV! This place was supposed to be special. Where are the amateurs?

I checked this out, this spot was produced and entered by professional filmmakers that worked on Hollywood films like Terminator, etc... check out their website. for a supposed - Consumer Generated Content Contest? corporation's generated contest..more like it They also claim to have produced another - Mousetrap? WHY did this get featured by YouTube? What's up with this, should be called PRO-sumer Generated Video

I dont think there was a real contest at all, Just my opinion...

Central in this category of response are thoughts and inferences about the CGA creators, including ruminations on their qualifications and motivations for developing CGAs. Prognostications regarding a creator's professional status and brand affiliation were common as viewers tried to make sense of the ads they were viewing. These probes were often directed squarely at the advertising creators themselves. While supportive commentary was posted, viewers also frequently challenged ad creators, and sometimes levied personal attacks. The CGA setting is unique in its ability to prompt scrutiny of and interchange with the ad creator. The provision of a personified route for ad engagement not only distinguishes the medium, it also offers a deeper path for relationship building by providing connections with the person behind the message for the brand (Berry, 1983; Sheth & Parvatiyar, 1995).

WAY TO GO CHEVY! And congrats to the Freshman Gal Creator! It's about time, that we start getting back to the catchy upbeat tunes and commercials that make us excited about an
AMERICAN product! This one was OUTSTANDING! Especially the fact that it was created and written by a Freshman girl in college! Hats off to you! We need to keep in mind...BUY WHAT AMERICANS BUILD...BUY CHEVROLET!!! I give this one a PERFECT TEN!!!! – Chevy

Your video seems far more Wii-centric than 360-focused, so I think it's safe to say you're a very frustrated Nintendo fan who wants to see his manbaby toys "Own" the competition. - Wii

This entrant did not choose the judges, nor make any of the decisions. Why all the put downs?? I congratulate the winner, as well as all of the beautiful women who took the time to be in this ad. I don't know your backgrounds, lives-hardships or successes. But I commend all of you and especially Arielle and the rest of the lovely ladies. – Dove

Change something? it's so clear...never. Thank you for the honest, direct idea. I love it and so will the rest of America if they are intelligent enough to understand this commercial. I will buy DOVE. You go girls. – Dove

Entertainment Value: In addition to cognitive elaboration of the ad message and the process of CGA creation, viewers also became engaged in CGAs for their pure entertainment value. Comments regarding the humor, uniqueness, cleverness, and overall pleasure in watching CGAs were common in viewer postings, as they are with traditional ads (Vakratsas & Ambler, 1999). This type of ad engagement is captured in the familiar \( A_{ad} \), which is known to mediate brand attitudes and purchase intentions for traditional advertising messages (MacKenzie et al. 1986; Mitchell and Olson 1981; Shimp 1981). Our experimental results also implicate \( A_{ad} \) responses. The following quotes are characteristic of entertainment-oriented responses to CGAs.

Great Commercial!! Every year we anticipate for the super bowl commercials and this year the one that had us all cracking up was the Chevy car wash commercial.. I think it was hilarious, the old gentleman really had me in stitches..here s to a job well done!!" - Chevy HHR

ABSOLUTELY AWESOME! Where did you find that CHECK OUT GIRL? She's hilarious!! – Doritos

That's the funniest Super Bowl commercial yet! LOL - Doritos

LMFAOOOOOOOO.. THIS IS TOOO GOOOD!! I FCKIN LOVE IT. SUCKS tht Horde was used for the fckin persians -_-.. but hella good job – World of Warcraft

Type 2: Engagement with the Brand. A second type of engagement implicates the brand as focal object rather than the ad. At a very basic level, brand engagement concerns people's interactions
with the brand or reflections on its meaning and promise, including attitudinal declarations and professed interest in using the brand. With brand engagement viewers can also participate in the conversation as brand advocates, or offer demonstrations of personal identification and connections with the brand.

Brand Attitudes and Experiences: Comments coded in this category provide evidence of a person’s involvement with, opinion of, and interest in the brand. These include expressions of brand support, discussion of past brand experiences, and intentions to purchase the brand.

I loved this one and so did my sister, she called long distance just to say she was ready to buy a Chevy. – Chevy HRR

This has told me a million times more information than all the real PSP commercials ever made, PLUS, if I didn't already own one, I’d want to buy one now. – Sony PSP

This commercial makes me want to go out and buy dove creamoil body wash! The girls in the commercial are very relatable. Great job, can't wait to see it play during the oscars! – Dove

When I go home today I’m downloading Firefox. I’ve only heard about it a couple times in passing before now. Which is why I haven’t switched. But man.. nothing worse than having your browser crash when you're mast...er.. working on important internet documents. – Firefox

That brought a little tear to my eye! So beautiful, endearing and perfect for Etsy! If I didn't already know what Etsy was, after seeing that video, I'd have to check it out! Congratulations, Daniel!!!!! - Etsy

Brand Advocacy: Brand advocacy occurs when people actively promote the brand to others (Smith & Wheeler, 2002). Comments coded as brand advocacy purposely work to persuade others by defending the brand against competition, extolling the brand’s virtues and distinguishing qualifications, or showcasing brand devotion with the intention to persuade. Brand advocacy discussion also focused on promulgating the brand’s meaning so as to help others understand the brand proposition, and providing displays of intimate brand knowledge that enliven the brand for others while distinguishing the user as one with close ties to the brand.

well if you haven't used firefox (or opera) ie (internet explorer) is a great improvement over ie 6. but when you look at firefox its like a more usable product. the tabs run more smoothly the interface is easier to manage. its customizable. it has loads of add ones
(free as well some ie 7 addons need money :O). i can download youtube videos with it! i can select which site are permitted to run java etc. - Firefox

dont you ps3 fanboys get it? sony are just trying to copy everything microsoft does but the fact of the matter is 360 is doing it better. nintendo doesn't care about HD or Blu ray, it cares about actually taking a step forward in the gaming industry. its about gameplay not better graphics. - Wii

Definitely go with Firefox; it's safer, easier, and faster!!! Everybody who has used it will never go back to IE. Those who haven't tried it are the only ones who prefer IE (Internet Explorer).” – Firefox

Brand-Self Connections: Engagement with the brand also manifests in the sharing of evidence regarding a person’s personal consumer-brand relationship and other vivid, evocative illustrations of the brand-self connection. This form of brand engagement reflects the active use of brands to create, refine, and reflect the self, an idea with a long tradition in the marketing literature (Belk, 1988; S. Fournier, 1998). A common mode of expression involves shared narratives that bring alive the person’s experience with the brand (Escalas, 2004; Escalas & Bettman, 2003).

These videos brought tears to my eyes. Yes, I am a sap...but those are some wonderful videos and they all remind me why I love it here :) – Etsy

It just all makes me so proud to be part of this amazing, creative, bubbly, bright and never-boring community. – Etsy

when my car was broke down I was very happy on the bus ... I didnt have to worry about other idiot drivers . I had my PSP to make the experience that much better. – Sony PSP

SUPER BAD AD. My family has been associtated with the sales of Chevrolet vehicles since 1928....Grandfather....father and me.... SUPER BAD AD...customers have even called my cell phone wanting to contact GM to state their dislike...disgust – Chevy HHR

Brand meaning co-creation is central to the expression of the brand-self connection (Allen, Susan Fournier, & Miller, 2007; McCracken, 1986; Holt, 1995), and our data suggest that CGAs provide a fertile space for the active negotiation of brand meaning that allows people to forge a deeper relationship between the self and the brand. Unlike scripted company-generated ads, CGAs created by numerous, unrelated, and authentic ad creators often contain a multitude of brand meanings, some of which may
even conflict. These brand meanings were actively negotiated and debated among forum commentators. For example, in the Dove CGAs, the meaning of beauty and its interfaces vis-à-vis the brand and the individual provided rich material which viewers used to elaborate and reflect on the brand and ad campaign.

Women need to know that they are beautiful even as they age. Our lines are not flaws, but part of our beauty. We want the products that we use everyday to help our skin stay beautiful. DOVE is that product!

It’s sending the wrong message.........why would you advertise on a Dove commercial that you change everything about yourself?

NO, this commercial asks “If you could change something, what would you change?”...the girl who later responds “everything” demonstrates how distorted our views of ourselves are. The ad ACTUALLY says women DON’T need to constantly think about their “flaws”; “wash them away.” Such is seen in the end of the commercial when none of the women have red lines on them anymore—and are happy. They know Dove is for REAL women and also realize all women are beautiful!!!...Great message and VERY CLEAR.

Agree. This ad is brilliant. Every woman has no problem pointing out their own flaws according to society’s standard of beauty. But beauty comes in all forms and this commercial encourages all women to be proud of their beauty.

Type 3: Engagement with the Brand Community. The third type of engagement occurs at a socio-cultural level: that of the community of the brand. Brand community engagement demonstrates an ability to go beyond the typical vehicles of marketing—the ad and the brand—to the social environments in which these meanings are made. Brand community engagement involves brand-level debates that establish the in-group versus out-group boundaries on which brand communities thrive (Schouten & McAlexander, 1995). It also involves expressions of a shared sense of moral responsibility that binds brand community members to each other (Muñiz & O’Guinn, 2001). Displays and pronouncements of this form of engagement connote and promote membership within the community of the brand.

In-Group/Out-Group Debates: Brand debates are essential to brand community function as they help to establish the boundary lines that separate those inside the community (the in-group) from those that are not members of the community (the out-group) (Muñiz & O’Guinn, 2001). With strong community brands, there often exists an opposing “enemy” brand against which the community derives much meaning and
purpose: Harley-Davidson versus Japanese motorcycle manufacturer Kawasaki, for example, or Apple versus Microsoft and IBM. Brand debates contained in CGA postings often involved open conflicts between brand supporters and opposing brand loyalists (Muniz and O’Guinn 2001). These confrontations were heated and emotional and contrast sharply with the collaborative exchanges that help build relationships around a brand as demonstrated by the following post.

Are you sissies gonna let this guy just waltz onto this thread and make a disparaging comment about Obama? You should be ashamed to call yourselves progressive! Come on! fight! –Obama/Clinton

The Wii, Firefox, Sony PSP, World of Warcraft ads disproportionately sparked oppositional brand stances. Rather than engaging members within their individual brand communities, the majority of viewer-viewer interchanges for these brands were directed at out-group members with opposing brand affiliations or towards warring subcultures within the community who made their way to the CGA sites. Engagement of the brand communities for Wii, Firefox, Sony PSP and World of Warcraft thus focused more on deriding competing brands and subcultures rather than bolstering the focal brand community, as demonstrated by the following sparring posts.

Poster 1: You’re so ignorant. Humans with cloaks look more like spartans than trolls, orcs, or cows. A human is more similar to what they were trying to do here. And try to say alliance is for little kids when I come and pwn you with my level 80 night elf hunter.

Poster 2: uh yea and how old are you? 12? your balls probably havent dropped yet. so shut the fuck up and go tell your mom i said the f word.

Poster 1: I'm not telling you anything personal. I DON'T live with my mom. I DON'T care about "the f word". You can't tell how old someone is by their name. You cant tell how old someone is by what kinds of legendary monstrosities they choose to play on a computer game. And if it was possible to tell age by what monsters ppl choose to play and how they talk, i'd say YOU were closer to 12 than I am. You most likely don't even play WoW. You prob just wan't to start pointless fights. Your turn, kid :P – World of Warcraft

Moral Responsibility: A second marker of brand community is a sense of moral responsibility to support fellow brand community members in whatever ways one can (Muniz and O’Guinn 2001). Moral
responsibility was manifest in CGA postings that offered brand information sharing and helping behavior. Since community members gain considerable specialized knowledge about the brand, sharing can provide members with a valuable resource that assists in brand usage (Muniz Jr and Schau 2005). Information sharing also helps reinforce community standards while providing members with the ability to act as a cohesive group in opposition to external threats.

OMG! This is driving me nuts! I have looked online for a pic or location of the mob shown at 1:39...nothing! IDK if its a mob from an earlier version that they discontinued or what. But it seems it no longer exists. If anyone knows anything about this please feel free to message me. :)

i think its a boss from blackrock were Nefarian is – World of Warcraft

How do you get firefox? I use IE and that SUCKS and I want firefox! Does it cost money or what? Someone please tell me!

Just go to www.mozilla.com/firefox. It’s freeware, you don’t have to pay and it’s awesome software. – Firefox

**Type 4: Engagement with the Community-at-large.** The fourth and final type of engagement transcends the brand and focuses on the personal and social relationships that unite members of a broad cultural group. Here, viewers interact outside the realm of marketing and within the context of interpersonal relationships. Community-building manifests in two main activities: (1) as outreach toward an individual or sub-group for purposes of relationship initiation or deepening, and (2) through community-organizing activities that work to unite and express solidarity, or reaffirm the purpose of the group. While community level relationships may be sparked initially through shared brand experiences, engagement with the community-at-large concerns the people independent of the brand.

*Relationship Building and Alliances:* The data provide many examples wherein the provision of a CGA for a particular brand sparked the development of personal relationships. As conversations between viewers unfolded across time, it was not uncommon for people to call each other by name, suggesting deepening levels of intimacy. Outreach toward particular individuals for purposes of relationship initiation or deepening was observed, including intimate self disclosures and signals for mutual sharing of information.
along relationship-development lines. In select cases, personal relationships were pursued outside the CGA website environment, sometimes even migrating offline. Below is evidence of first-stage relationship advances and budding friendships that are no longer mediated through the Dove brand.

I'm 42 and just started skydiving in my late 30's. I just love the freedom of flying. The views are spectacular and the relaxing feeling is like no other. If anyone would like to learn more about it please feel free to write or visit skydivergirls.com. The whole deal is about building self-confidence through sports. Share the Love of Life!

I will do that!

Hkfc...that's why I like you so much along with many of my friends....best wishes to you no matter what...for the rest I'm going to e-mail you!

Hi Jannette, it's me, KFC from SkydiverGirls! I'm thrilled to see you and GoddessLAM are so positive vibe! We're going to have a great time at the awards....Anyway, thanks for the sweet note and tell your mom thanks too... she seems super nice and she's right, we all have won :-)

Engagement with the community-at-large also reflects another characteristic tenet: as communities grow, they often fragment into more cohesive, specialized sub-groups. CGA postings provided evidence of the formation of and identification with sub-groups that help clarify relational bonds. For the Dove ad, alliances formed around the perceived treatment of various group members, or interpretations of the values held within the group. In the following quote, a Dove poster defends a contestant and in the process distances herself from another contingency developing within the group:

Again--ashmannley. stop being so judgmental. you don't KNOW the other two contestants. take a look at other videos. both jannette and goddess have complimented MANY competitors before AND after the top 10 were announced. so kiss it. because you're wrong.

Community Organizing: Community organizing involves expressions of solidarity that unite people toward social goals and reaffirm the purpose of the group. Muniz and O'Guinn’s (2001) concept of a consciousness-of-kind or shared sense of belonging and “we-ness” captures this solidarity, though in the present context, the consciousness concerns belonging to a broader, non-brand-specific social group.
With community organizing, members are mobilized to take action and assert their power as a collective. The following posts demonstrate the collective voice for the Dove and Obama brands.

_Hey REAL WOMEN...I'm down with bronchitis today so won't participate as much, but to say that the MOST POWERFUL thing to do is write Unilever and Dove (addresses are under Rules 10 & 11) I did this once with Mazda when I felt fraud and they bent over backwards to investigate and get things straigtened out...that's who really does care...big corporations don't want their images tarnished...I got the help of an attorney friend who threatened to sue them...there's more POWER in #'s!! – Dove_

_Now your talking my language Brent. Time to get off the liberal Democrat horse and start calling these people out! don't make it a Dem vs Rep thing. Its a spend vs not spend thing. Let's get off the Obama bandwagon, because thats not going anywhere. Yeah we the people are screwed and we the people know it. We just have to do something about. Obama is not the answer, never was, never will be. Congress is a bunch of spineless toads. We need real change and these people are not it. Now we’re talking. – Obama/Clinton_

_anyone have any problem with the way TV and HOLLYWOOD depict criminals today? actually it's a phenomena of the last 10 years or so. i occasionally watch COLD CASE which takes place supposedly in PHILADELPHIA. although blacks comprise probably 80% of the population there, it's......guess who.......that is constantly depicted as the criminal!.......other shows do the same thing and so does HOLLYWOOD! what kind of blatant lies are being told here?..........and WHY? -Obama/Clinton_

**Moderators of the Engagement Process.** The CGAs we studied were not all equal in their ability to generate progressively deeper engagement forms. Our results expose different patterns of engagement with CGAs, but the ad groupings were different than we anticipated thorough our study design. There were no systematic differences between organic versus contest-inspired CGAs. An ad-hoc analysis of response patterns suggests other moderating factors that inform a working contingency theory of CGA effects.

The first proposed moderating factor concerns brand effects. Engagement with respect to the Etsy, Wii, Sony PSP, Firefox, and World of Warcraft ads centered on the brand level, with brand debates that dominated viewer postings more so than for other brands. It is important to note that these brands can legitimately claim community status (Muñiz & O’Guinn, 2001) and engage marketing programs that leverage brand community as a core foundation of the brand. Further, there exist strong roles for
oppositional brand community groups with respect to Wii, Sony PSP, Firefox, and World of Warcraft: Microsoft Xbox and Sony PS2 versus Wii, and Internet Explorer versus Firefox, for example. A brand’s community status may therefore govern its ability to evoke engagement at the level of the brand.

Engagement for the Dove ads, in contrast, centered on engagement with the community-at-large. The majority of Dove postings evidenced protracted viewer-to-viewer and viewer-to-creator conversations that provided evidence of support for and interdependence between people. Rather than the brand serving as the unifying force bonding these women and distinguishing them from the opposition, Dove CGA viewers were united by a resonant cultural tension that defined women’s self perceptions and set the group against a common foe: the beauty industry at large. Community engagement levels were higher for Dove than other brand exemplars. The Etsy conversation also centered on a cultural tension, that of mass production, with the uniqueness, creativity, and authenticity of its members a central tenant binding the community as a whole. For Dove and Etsy, CGA served as a tool involving consumers in deeper discussions about the broader cultural systems feeding meaning to the brand.

Engagement for two CGAs under study—Chevy HHR and Doritos—centered squarely on engagement at the advertising level; deeper engagement with the brand, the brand community, or the community-at-large was not inspired. Both of these ads pursued humor as an advertising strategy, which yielded high entertainment value and positive $A_{ad}$ response. As indicated in our experimental study, some CGAs may provide little engagement benefit beyond $A_{ad}$ increases. Advertising strategy may contribute to a contingency-based understanding of CGA effects.

**Discussion and Next Steps**

Our research supports practitioner assumptions of CGA as a powerful communication tool. Results demonstrate response advantages for CGAs in terms of personal relevance, executional quality, $A_{ad}$, brand interest, and purchase intent, and provide evidence of the capability of CGAs for involving the viewer in a complex and sometimes involving engagement process. Our findings support a multifaceted model of consumer engagement underlying viewers’ CGA experiences, with qualitatively different levels
of involvement based on the focal object of the engagement response. We define engagement as a complex psycho-social process of interaction and meaning making that establishes connections between the person and the ad, the brand, the brand community, and the community-at-large. We suggest that it is this multifaceted process of engagement that drives CGA outperformance and effects.

Contributions to Engagement Theory

The multifaceted engagement construct at the core of our findings differs from that posed in the literature in several important ways. First, within our model, personal involvement in the advertising message—a response that serves as the core of most operationalizations of engagement—stands as but one rudimentary dimension in a complex process of ways in which consumers engage with ads. Second, our model helps socialize the engagement construct beyond dominant psychological conceptualizations. Research in advertising has historically focused on cognitive engagement at the level of the advertisement, leaving socio-cultural responses out. This view fails to acknowledge the lived reality that consumers not only respond to advertising content, but also actively engage in creating, interpreting, and using ads in the context of their social lives (Ritson and Elliott 1999). Though engagement may start as a process of personal relevance or involvement with the brand and its message, deeper engagement comes about because people engage with each other. Social engagement is powerful: the deepest levels of engagement we observe in our data emerge when ad content becomes the medium through which consumers express themselves so as to connect with others. In this expanded conception of engagement, advertising transitions from a branded message to a medium for communication and interaction in its own right.

Relatedly, our model incorporates the notion of consumer co-creation that is central to the new marketing paradigm and key to the general process of consumers’ engagement (Quelch and Jocz 2008). Our engagement facets accommodate the interpretative meaning making activities that surround the processing of CGAs. The idea of brand co-ownership is inextricably embodied in the CGA phenomenon but has been absent from process models of CGA effects.
Our findings also make salient select participants in the process of consumer engagement that have received little attention to date. CGAs incorporate an additional stakeholder in the usual viewer-ad-brand triad: the creator of the ad. Now a separate, identifiable, and personalized entity, the ad creator becomes a central facilitator of consumer engagement, offering an additional platform on which to generate engagement response. Ad creators can serve as bridges to deeper engagement levels by allowing personal connections into the brand community and the community-at-large. Moreover, freelance ad creators possess no inextricable ties to the brand or the company, and thus allow for more authentic engagement response.

The paradigm shifts reflected in our engagement model are summarized in Table 2.

A Preliminary Contingency Theory of CGA Effects

Our findings provide both support for, and a challenge to, the contention that CGAs present consistent process advantages in terms of consumer engagement. While across our two studies we find evidence that CGA can influence viewers’ engagement, there does not appear to be a “wholesale” CGA effect. In our lab study, which was limited to one brand and one product category, we were able to show that CGA encourages ad and brand engagement. However, in a natural environment, different patterns of consumer engagement with CGAs emerged. CGA effects are complex and must be viewed in the context of the situations in which they are embedded, including, as noted here, the brand’s community status and the advertising strategy adopted for the brand. Taken together, our studies provide initial ideas for a contingency-based understanding of CGA effects.

Future Research and Next Steps

There is promise in advertising research that considers the multi-faceted process of consumer engagement and the factors at play in this space. Future research on the role of the ad creator in mediating engagement response is warranted. Ad creators may operate as a catalyst for deeper levels of
viewer engagement by providing personal connections into the brand community and the community-at-large as well as an accountable source of trust and credibility for message claims. Multiple ad creators, each with a different brand voice and interpretation, may also open up brand meaning making to a broader group and encourage higher levels of meaning negotiation than would be present for company-controlled ads.

The ad creation process can also be scrutinized in future research. Studies of consumer creativity (Dahl & Moreau, 2007; Moreau & Dahl, 2005) demonstrate a preference for constrained creativity. Exactly how creative opportunities via CGA should be designed is an interesting question. For example, Chevy Tahoe provided a toolbox for the easy creation and dissemination of CGAs while Firefox and Converse offered no constraints on people’s creative processes. Research investigating the role of CGA competitions in consumer engagement could also prove useful. In our data, active debates were waged concerning CGAs selection processes (e.g., via unanimous vote, a panel of experts, or community commentary and response) and the attributions of fairness these processes raise. The role of competitions in promoting a shared sense of moral responsibility to protect brand meanings and defend their authenticity can also be explored.

There exist limitations of the present study, and these too provide platforms for future research. Our experimental study included but one brand and offered no information about the ad producer or the type of CGA produced. Additionally, though a contingency model is suggested in our qualitative data, we do not fully specify nor test these effects. Future experimental work should consider the peripheral and central processing encouraged by different advertising strategies (e.g., humor versus values-based advertising) and patterns of engagement associated with source (e.g., organic versus company-sponsored ads) and brand (e.g., community brand status versus not) effects.
### Table 1: Experimental Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Mean (SD) No Source</th>
<th>Mean (SD) CGA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executional Quality (Adapted from Singh, Balasubramanian &amp; Chakvaparty 2000)</strong></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.76 (1.25)</td>
<td>3.21 (1.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The acting (or animation) was professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The actors (or animated characters) were appealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ad had very good colors</td>
<td>3.88 (1.70)</td>
<td>4.13 (1.68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ad was well executed</td>
<td>3.66 (1.69)</td>
<td>4.26 (1.65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ad was well paced</td>
<td>4.00 (1.94)</td>
<td>4.14 (1.70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The music/sound in the ad was enjoyable</td>
<td>3.56 (1.80)</td>
<td>3.88 (1.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The story line in the ad was compelling</td>
<td>3.07 (1.66)</td>
<td>3.80 (1.64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance (Adapted from Lastovicka 1983)</strong></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.76 (1.25)</td>
<td>3.21 (1.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the commercial I thought how the product might be useful to me</td>
<td>2.52 (1.54)</td>
<td>3.11 (1.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ad did not have anything to do with me or my needs</td>
<td>3.23 (1.86)</td>
<td>3.68 (1.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ad was meaningful to me</td>
<td>2.53 (1.47)</td>
<td>2.84 (1.43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aad (Adapted from Homer 1995)</strong></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.1 (1.63)</td>
<td>4.59 (1.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant - Unpleasant</td>
<td>4.64 (1.42)</td>
<td>4.96 (1.52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like - Dislike</td>
<td>3.97 (1.95)</td>
<td>4.55 (1.66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good - Bad</td>
<td>3.93 (1.76)</td>
<td>4.42 (1.68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable - Unfavorable</td>
<td>3.86 (1.77)</td>
<td>4.41 (1.64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.87 (1.28)</td>
<td>2.65 (1.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would seek out more information about the Yaris brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchase Intent</strong></td>
<td>2.08 (1.31)</td>
<td>2.71 (1.85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would consider Yaris as a potential future car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Paradigm Shifts Associated with Consumer Engagement of CGAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From...</th>
<th>To...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viewer responses to advertising messages</td>
<td>Multidimensional process of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological response models</td>
<td>Socio-cultural process of relationships and meaning making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad as product</td>
<td>Ad as process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad and brand as focal object</td>
<td>Brand community and social relationships enabled through advertising as focal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement as message</td>
<td>Advertisement as medium in which meaning is made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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